DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 114 EA 019 025

AUTHOR Williams, Ronnie L.
TITLE Early Detection Factors Common to Potential School Dropouts, 1984-85.
PUB DATE 18 Jun 85
NOTE 91p.; Presented to the Boone County Board of Education (West Virginia). Tables may not reproduce.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Attendance; Delinquency; Dropout Attitudes; Dropout Characteristics; Dropout Rate; *Dropout Research; *Dropouts; Educational Improvement; Family Influence; *High Risk Students; Parent Background; Parent Student Relationship; *Potential Dropouts; School Holding Power; School Responsibility; School Surveys; Secondary Education; Student Needs; *Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS West Virginia

ABSTRACT

Research and statistical data in this study identify factors that are correlated with early identification of potential dropout students. Chapter 1, the introduction, explains the study's focus: school areas that propagate attendance problems, family educational levels, social deviance, and academic achievement. One hundred students who had dropped out from a West Virginia county's three secondary schools over a 3-year period were compared to a control sample comprised of 50 of the schools' 1983-84 graduates. "Review of Research," chapter 2, analyzes previous research on common patterns in early detection. Chapter 3, "Organization of the Study," provides an overview of school performances in early detection factors. "Analysis of Research," chapter 4, presents data and charts that correlate factors with attendance. The final chapter summarizes study findings. Dropouts are absent from school more frequently and have lower test scores in reading, mathematics, and social studies than graduates. Dropouts' families have lower educational levels and parents usually are employed in unskilled areas or unemployed. Dropouts deal with the judicial system as juveniles and adults more often than do graduates. Early detection factors are interrelated; each factor alone does not necessarily predict dropping out, but a combination of factors increases the chances. Recommendations are that schools adopt preventive measures and implement specialized programs. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277114

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS 1984-85

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"IT'S NEVER TOO LATE!"

FIND OUT WHY...

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronnie L. Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 019 025

BOONE COUNTY SCHOOLS
RONNIE L. WILLIAMS
69 AVENUE B
MADISON, WEST VIRGINIA 25130

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

by

Ronnie L. Williams, B.S., M.A.

Presented To The
Boone County Board of Education

Dr. M. R. Walker, President
Mr. Richard Browning, Vice-President
Mr. Jim MacCallum, Member
Mr. Willis Elkins, Member
Mr. George Viars, Member

June 18, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Early Detection Factors
Common to
Potential School Dropouts

Chapter I Introduction and Statement of the Problem . . 1 - 25

A. Introduction 1
B. Statement of the Problem 2
C. Purpose of the Study 3
D. Hypothesis 4
E. Background and Significance 5
F. Definition of Terms 7
G. Limitations 10
H. Basic Assumptions 12
I. Instruments 13
J. Procedures for Collecting Data 16
K. Procedures for Analysis of Data 18
L. Dropout Data Sheet 20
M. Graduate Data Sheet 22
N. Footnotes 24
O. Bibliography 25

Chapter II Review of the Research . . . . . 26 - 41

A. Introduction 26
B. Age/Grade Correlation to Dropouts 28
C. Student Retention and Its Relationship to Dropouts 29
D. Academic Achievement in Relation to Dropouts 31
E. Student Absenteeism in Relation to Dropouts 34
F. Conclusion 38
G. Footnotes 39
H. Bibliography 41

Chapter III Organization of the Study . . . . . 44 - 51

A. Introduction 44
B. Age of Dropouts 44
C. Dropout Retention Rate 45
D. Correlation Betweeen Test Scores and Dropouts 46
E. Irregular School Attendance and Dropouts 47
F. Frequency of Court Appearances in Relation to Dropouts 48
G. Related Research
(1) Family Educational Levels of Dropouts 49
(2) Family Occupations of Dropouts. 49
H. Conclusion 51

Chapter IV Analysis of the Research . . . . . 54 - 71

A. Introduction 54
B. Dropouts Age 54
C. Retention Rate of Dropouts 55
D. Academic Performance of Dropouts 56
E. School Attendance of Dropouts 60
F. Court Appearances of Dropouts 65
G. Family Grade Completion of Dropouts 66
H. Parental Occupations of Dropouts 71

Chapter V Summary and Conclusion . . . . . 76 - 79

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The first years of a child's educational experiences may be termed as the most critical era in their total educational endeavors. Education has made dramatic improvements in structural design, classroom improvements, higher standards of certification of teachers, principals, and specialists. Even though monumental steps have been taken in the improvement of educational standards, there still remains an evident void in the early detection of potential dropouts. This problem is obvious when American schools experience a twenty to fifty percent dropout rate among their students. The wide variance of dropout percentages reveals the agressiveness of some students to overcome what appears to be insurmountable odds.

Even though the everpresent dropout facts and figures are bombarding State Department's of Education, as well as the local Boards of Education, very few educators have the facts and figures to formulate accurate detectors for early treatment of potential dropouts. One needs to be constantly aware that the Dropout Syndrome does not only exist in the public school setting. The evergrowing problem can be found in private schools, colleges, universities and even carries over into the area of individual employment.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem area this study will be addressing will be the identification of factors which are considered to be in direct correlation to the early identification of the potential dropout. The study will address attendance, parental influence, and social deviance as well as the student's ability in the correlation and analysis of the factors contributing to the dropout problem.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The study will be designed to correlate, evaluate and analyze the following areas of high risk children in regard to early detection of potential dropouts. The areas to be thoroughly evaluated to detect positive correlations.

A. Erratic attendance patterns that are directly correlated with dropouts.

B. Parental educational levels as a predictor to potential dropout status.

C. The direct correlation between judicial incidents and the likelihood of becoming a dropout.

The study will be designed to correlate data from the previously mentioned research areas. The final analysis will result in factual data utilization in the early and detection factors of dropouts in the school setting.

HYPOTHESIS

To productively complete the purpose of this study the following hypothesis must be formulated.

A. The students who exit the school setting will terminate their school affiliation when they are sixteen years of age.

B. A significant number of students who drop out of school will have repeated at least one grade during their schooling.

C. The control group of graduates will possess a lower percentage of retentions.

D. A direct correlation between test score results and dropping out of school will be evident in the areas of English, Math and Social Studies.

E. A direct correlation between irregular school attendance and becoming a potential dropout will be clearly evident.

F. A direct correlation will exist among graduates and low student absenteeism.

G. A high correlation will exist between juvenile court appearances and the percentage of school dropouts.

H. A high percentage of dropouts will maintain their socially unaccepted behavior as adults.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

According to a survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators only 4.7% of the administrators reported no critical school issues are related to attendance problems.[1] Therefore we may conclude that 92.3% of school administrators experience adminstrative problems that fall in the categories of class cutting, cutting whole days, chronic absenteeism, chronic tardiness, chronic absenteeism from individual classes, suspensions, expulsions and dropouts. The previous list of problems fall into the area of obvious attendance problems.

According to the American Association of School Administrators the correlative relationship between school influences, especially curriculum and attendance, has been poorly researched.[2] This study has been designed to provide research as well as statistical data concerning critical areas in the school which propagate attendance problems. The findings from this study will provide classroom teachers and administrators, with an instrument for early dropout detection. Throughout this study the researcher wishes to address the idea presented by the Boulder Colorado High School Principal, John Holback. Mr. Holback contends, even a well organized attendance program can be burdened with truancy problems if a vital component is missing--the student must be given a feeling of being needed and wanted. If the student feels his presence does not really matter to anyone but himself, then he probably will not care if he attends even a well-presented session.[3]

This study intends to substantiate that attendance problems precipitate undesirable problems in the areas of English, Math, Social Studies, as well as evident legal implications. The information rendered from this study may be utilized by classroom teachers, principals, and attendance workers to help prevent non-reversable attendance problems.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purposes of this study the following definitions have been formulated to provide clarity and continuity to the data rendered.

ABSENCE FROM SCHOOL - This term will be utilized to designate a student not being present in the school during the normal school day or any part of the day when classes are in session.

ACADEMIC SUCCESS RATE - This term will be utilized to designate the student's performance on a standardized academic achievement test. The scale for success can be evaluated as follows: A score of 0 (zero) will be termed as performing on grade level when tested. A score of 1.2 will be termed as performing one year and two months above grade level when tested. A score of -1.2 will be termed as performing one year and two months below grade level when the test was administered.

ADULT DEVIANCE - This term will be utilized to designate a male or female who is eighteen years of age or older. The individual has divergent behavior from the socially accepted norm and was found guilty of an act in a court of law.

ATTENDANCE PATTERNS - This term shall be utilized to designate the yearly days absent by grade level of graduates as well as dropouts. The averages will be compiled from fifty to eighty-five samples.

BOONE COUNTY DROPOUT STUDY - This term shall be utilized to designate a study completed by the Boone County Board of Education, Department of Attendance and Student Services in June, 1983 and revised in July 1984. This study gives an eleven year statistical breakdown of dropout data relevant to state, county, and individual school dropout statistics.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION - This term shall be used to designate any student who is between the ages of six and sixteen years of age and does not qualify for an attendance exemption in the West Virginia code section number eighteen.

CONTROL GROUP - This term will be used to designate graduates who will be utilized to substantiate a systematic comparison sample.

DROPOUT - The term will be utilized to designate any student who is sixteen years of age or older and withdraws from school before graduating.

DROPOUT DATA SHEET - This term will be utilized to designate a tool or form devised to secure vital student information on students who failed to successfully complete twelve years of education and withdrew from the formal school setting.

GRADUATE DATA SHEET - This term will be utilized to designate a tool or form devised to secure vital student information on students who successfully completed twelve years of education and are considered graduates by the state of West Virginia.

HIGH RISK CHILDREN - This term will be utilized in the study to designate children between the ages of five and eighteen years of age who possess one or more of the identifiable criterion as a potential dropout as designated in the study.

JUDICIAL DATA SHEET - The term will be used to designate any juvenile or adult who has been convicted of a violation of the state law in Boone County. This form will render the names of those found guilty, the number of offenses as well as designating the violation in the class of a juvenile or adult offense.

JUVENILE DEVIANCE - This term will be utilized to designate a male or female who has yet to reach his or her eighteenth birthday. This individual has divergent behavior from the socially accepted norm and was found guilty of an act in a court of law.

EARLY SCHOOL LEAVE - This term will be utilized in conjunction with the term dropout.

PARENTAL EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND - This term will be utilized in this study to compare the grade successfully completed by the mother and father of dropouts in relation to the grade successfully completed by the parents of the control group, the high school graduates.

LIMITATIONS

The study will be limited to a sample of one hundred students who have dropped out of Boone County's three secondary schools. The dropout sample was selected from a three year dropout list compiled by the West Virginia State Department of Education. The percentage of the student sample from each school as well as the proper distribution of male and female samples from the respective schools are in direct correlation to the Boone County Dropout Study conducted in June 1983 and revised in July 1984.

The control sample was limited to fifty graduates in the three respective county secondary schools. The sample was in direct correlation to the percentage of male and female students who graduated during the 1983-84 school year. There is no reason to believe the sample group would produce any significant differences, in relation to data evaluation, if the samples were increased or decreased. One must remember the data tabulations will be in relation to a student population totaling seven thousand. The social setting ranges from a high percentage of the student population from a rural setting where coal is the basic industry.

A small percentage of the student population comes from a semi-urban setting. All business in the sample area tends to be dependent on the coal industry. A small populus commutes to Charleston, the nearest urbal center for employment.

The sample data from the Boone County School System will render dropout statistics that will be of significant in Boone County as well as other public school systems. A final limitation must be made known, not all of the sample group provided the total amount of information requested on the study data sheet. All calculations were derived on the basis of the information received in the particular subject area being evaluated.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

It is assumed that the three Boone County High Schools utilized in the sample will render a realistic projection of the dropout data that is a true representation of the total county dropout statistics. Even though the factors related to school dropouts are numerous and interrelated, one could not expect every area to be statistically documented in this study. This study therefore addresses the areas that are felt to be of significance in early dropout detection. The dropout study therefore addresses the following areas of significance in early dropout detection: A) Attendance patterns, B) Academic achievement, C) Family educational levels and D) Social deviance patterns.

It is therefore assumed that the areas addressed are key points of observation in early dropout detection and prevention. The areas addressed will either be validated or proven inconsistent with the average dropout.

INSTRUMENTS

The instruments utilized to secure the vast array of data relating to dropouts are varied and extremely diversified. The information derived from the study will be thoroughly analyzed throughout the study to determine any correlation that may exist between the specified areas being tested and dropouts.

The first statistical instrument utilized in the study was a three year dropout report from the West Virginia State Department of Education. The report provided the names of Boone County's dropouts, the ages at which they dropped out, and the school from which they exited. This instrument was the most strategic tool in securing, classifying and evaluating further dropout information.

The second statistical instrument utilized was Boone County's Dropout Research Project, Part-One. This study was completed in June of 1983 and revised in July 1984. The eleven year compilation of dropout data was instrumental in the proper proportional distribution of dropout data sheets. The data sheets were distributed to each school in relation to the number of dropouts charged to each school. This instrument was functional in designating the proper percentage of male and female samples from each school. The document contained the dropouts' attitudes toward leaving school. The data found in this instrument will be utilized throughout the study for classifying and evaluating further dropout information.

The third instrument utilized in the compilation of data was the 1982-83 West Virginia Department of Education Dropout Summary Report For Boone County. The report thoroughly summarizes the dropout report forms

completed for the State Department by the school counselor, principal, or county attendance worker. The reports are compiled in each county by the individual in charge of the county testing and evaluation program. A monthly composit of the county dropout reports are forwarded to the West Virginia State Department of Education. The state then tabulates and evaluates each item by computer and returns the findings to the respective county.

The items evaluated by this instrument in relation to dropouts are A) work plans, B) future educational plans, C) the school's reason for dropping out, D) the pupils reason given for dropping out, E) parental attitude toward dropping out, F) what measures would it take to keep the student in school?, G) what extent did the dropout participate in extra-curricular activities?, H) what special efforts were implemented to salvage the dropout?, I) the number of years the dropout was retained, J) the number of courses failed, K) attendance patterns, L) disciplinary record, M) class sizes, N) rank in class, O) scholastic ability, P) reading level, Q) the dropout's program of study, R) age at the time of dropping out, S) the number of times the dropout has changed his status, T) the grade level at the time of exiting the school setting, U) the economic status of the family of the dropout and V) the educational level of the dropout's family.

This sophisticated statistical instrument is extremely thorough in the compilation of dropout data on the state, county, and individual secondary school levels. The information will be continually utilized throughout the study. The information rendered will be of benefit in securing further statistical data, evaluating and properly classifying data.

The fourth instrument utilized in securing information on the designated number of dropouts was the dropout data sheet. The instrument was devised to secure pertinent data from the dropout's permanent record folder. The information on the data sheet was secured in relation to previously identified areas that directly relate to the potential dropout. The information secured on the data sheet was: sex of the dropout, schools attended, attendance record for grades one through eleven, the last CTBS scores and the education levels of the parents.

The fifth instrument that proved profitable in securing information for comparative purposes was the graduate data sheet. This instrument compiled the same information that was secured on the dropout data sheet. Therefore this instrument was utilized to give a comparative measure for the control group.

The sixth and final instrument utilized in this study was a judicial data sheet. The information on this data sheet was derived from a judicial activity listings in Boone County's, Circuit Clerk's Office. The document provided the names of all juvenile offenders as well as adult offenders in Boone County. The data on adults was secured to include a sample of adults that would be eighteen years of age and could not be over nineteen years of age. Therefore the adult list incorporates only one year of dropouts for comparative purposes.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

The first data secured in relation to the study regrading early dropout detection, was the request to the West Virginia State Department of Education for a three year list of dropouts from Boone County. The request was stated to group the dropouts in relation to the year they exited school as well as the school from which they exited.

The second source of information was the Boone County Dropout Study--Part-One. This study was completed in June 1983 and revised in July 1984. The information derived from the document represents an eleven year statistical study of dropouts in the state, county, as well as individual county secondary schools. The eleven dropout averages were the key for securing the proper data from the individual school samples. The individual secondary school samples are as follows: A) Scott High School: Sample of forty dropouts, twenty-three males and seventeen females; B) Sherman High School: Sample of forty-seven dropouts, twenty-seven males and twenty females; C) Van High School: Sample of Thirteen dropouts, seven males and six females. The data secured from this document was necessary to secure a true and accurate sample of dropouts for comparative purposes.

The third instrument utilized in the study for securing dropout information was the use of dropout and graduate files. Permission was secured from the Superintendent of Boone County Schools to secure the needed data. The only limitation was the data secured was to remain confidential and individual data must not be identifiable. The students sampled on the data sheet comprised one hundred dropouts of which eighty five were proportionally utilized due to the computer program overload.

Fifty graduate data sheets were proportionallly compiled to render data for a control group comparison.

The dropout and data sheets were completed by the following procedure. The dropouts and graduates are filed alphabetically in separate files in the respective secondary schools. A random sample selection of every sixth student file folder was completed. Once the data had been collected, the information will be transferred to a computer program where the information is compiled, totaled and averaged for comparative purposes.

Permission was obtained from the Judge of the Circuit Court of Boone County for the court files addressing juvenile and adult convictions to be opened in regard to educational research. The only restriction placed on the materials was confidentiality. The lengthy list of juvenile and adult offenders was placed in a computer program for comparison purposes. Cross reference techniques were utilized in the comparison of dropouts who have had juveniles or adult court convictions within Boone County. One needs to remember that convictions outside of Boone County were not tabulated.

PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA

At the conclusion of the data collection and recording procedures, the data will be analyzed. Where applicable, the means will be computed in relation to the categorized data. The standard deviation will be computed from the Multi Plan computer program, which was designed by the Micro Soft Corporation.

The hypothesis that there is a significant difference between the previously identified categories in school data will now proceed one step further to being substantiated. The study will proceed to prove the significance of the mean. The formula utilized for the standard error of the mean is:

$$SE_M \text{ OF } O_M = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Where σ = The standard deviation of the population and N = the number of cases in the sample.

The next procedure utilized in this study is the significance of the difference between the means. The purpose of this statistical calculation is to determine whether the difference between two means is large enough to be considered as real and dependable. The formula utilized in this statistical calculation is:

$$\sigma_D = \sigma\ (M_1 - M_2) = \sqrt{\sigma^2 M_1 + \sigma^2 M_2}$$

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2 1}{N^1} + \frac{\sigma^2 2}{N^2}}$$

(Standard error of the difference between uncorrelated means)

In which:

σ_{M1} = The SE of the mean of the first sample

σ_{M2} = The SE of the mean of the second sample

σ_{D} = The SE of the difference between the two sample means

N_1 and N_2 = The sizes of the two samples.

The next question to be considered is whether or not the mean difference is large enough to cast a doubt on the hypothesis. To properly answer the question, one must compute the critical ratio or CR. The CR is found by dividing the difference between the sample means by its standard error (CR = D/O D). This operation reduces the obtained difference to a O score, and enables one to measure it along the base line of the sampline distribution of differences.

Levels of significance must be designated for the research project to be valid .01 as being non significant and .05 as clearly being significant. One shall therefore conclude a sampling analysis of this nature will provide conclusive evidence of the relevance of the sample results.

DROPOUT DATA SHEET

NAME: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

SOCIAL SECURITY NO.:_____ DATE OF BIRTH:_____ SEX:____ RACE:_____

MARITAL STATUS: _____Single _____Married _____Separated _____Divorced

PRESENT JOB STATUS: __Employed __Unemployed If employed complete the following:

JOB TITLE:_____ DATE OF HIRE:_____

NAME, ADDRESS, AND PHONE NUMBER OF EMPLOYER:_____

List Previous Job Experiences: _____

_____

Name and Address of last school attended:_____

Dropout Date:_____ Grade you were in at the time of the dropout_____

List names, addresses, and dates of previous schools attended:

In county: _____

_____

Out of county: _____

_____

Out of state: _____

_____

ATTENDANCE RECORD:

Days Absent: K- 1- 2- 3- 4- 5- 6- 7- 8- 9- 10- 11- 12-_____

_____

LAST CTBS SCORES:
Reading:_____ Mathematics:_____ Social Studies:_____

GRADE LEVEL WHEN LAST CTBS WAS TAKEN:_____

HAS DROPOUT HAD ANY COURT CASES?_____If so, HOW MANY_____

FAMILY HISTORY OF DROPOUT

FATHERS NAME: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

MARITAL STATUS: _____Single _____Married _____Separated _____ Divorced

LAST GRADE COMPLETED IN SCHOOL: _____

PRESENT JOB STATUS: ____Employed ____Unemployed If employed complete the following:

JOB TITLE: _____ DATE OF HIRE: _____

Name, Address, and Phone Number of Employer: _____

_____

MOTHERS NAME: _____ Phone Number: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

MARITAL STATUS: _____Single _____Married _____Separated _____Divorced

LAST GRADE COMPLETED IN SCHOOL: _____

PRESENT JOB STATUS: ____Employed ____Unemployed IF EMPLOYED COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

JOB TITLE: _____ DATE OF HIRE: _____

NAME, ADDRESS, AND PHONE NUMBER OF EMPLOYER: _____

_____

LIST BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER: _____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

GRADUATE DATA SHEET

NAME: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

SOCIAL SECURITY NO: _____ DATE OF BIRTH: _____ SEX: ___ RACE: _____

MARITAL STATUS: _____ Single _____ Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced

PRESENT JOB STATUS: ____ Employed _____ Unemployed IF EMPLOYED COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

JOB TITLE: _____ DATE OF HIRE: _____ NAME, ADDRESS, AND PHONE NUMBER OF

EMPLOYER: _____

_____

LIST PREVIOUS JOB EXPERIENCES: _____

_____

NAME AND ADDRESS OF LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED: _____

DROPOUT DATE: _____ GRADE YOU WERE IN AT THE TIME OF THE DROPOUT _____

LIST NAMES, ADDRESSS, AND DATES OF PREVIOUS SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

IN COUNTY: _____

_____

OUT OF COUNTY: _____

_____

OUT OF STATE: _____

_____

ATTENDANCE RECORDS:

DAYS ABSENT: K- 1- 2- 3- 4- 5- 6- 7- 8- 9- 10- 11- 12-

LAST CTBS SCORES:

READING: _____ MATHEMATICS _____ SOCIAL STUDIES _____

GRADE LEVEL WHEN LAST CTBS WAS TAKEN: _____

HAS DROPOUT HAD ANY COURT CASES? _____ IF SO, HOW MANY _____

FAMILY HISTORY OF GRADUATE

FATHERS NAME: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

MARITAL STATUS: _____Single _____Married _____Separated _____Divorced

LAST GRADE COMPLETED IN SCHOOL: _____

PRESENT JOB STATUS: ___Employed ___Unemployed If employed complete the following:

JOB TITLE: _____ DATE OF HIRE: _____

NAME, ADDRESS, AND PHONE NUMBER OF EMPLOYER: _____

_____

MOTHERS NAME: _____ PHONE NUMBER: _____
first middle last

ADDRESS: _____
street city state zip

MARITAL STATUS: _____Single _____Married _____Separated _____Divorced

LAST GRADE COMPLETED IN SCHOOL: _____

PRESENT JOB STATUS: ___Employed ___Unemployed If employed complete the following:

JOB TITLE _____ DATE OF HIRE _____

NAME, ADDRESS, AND PHONE NUMBER OF EMPLOYER: _____

_____

LIST BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER: _____

_____

_____

OTHER COMMENTS: _____

_____.

FOOTNOTES

1) Neill, Shirley Bowes: "American Association of School Administrators, Critical Issues Report Keeping Students in School, Problems and Solutions", P. 7

2) Neill, Shirley Bowes: "American Association of School Administrators, Critical Issues Report Keeping Students in School, Problems and Solutions", P. 24

3) Neill, Shirley Bowes: "American Association of School Administrators, Critical Issues Report Keeping Students in School, Problems and Solutions", P. 23

LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

BOOKS

1) Corsini, Raymond J., Individual Education Published for Bervard Community Individual Education, Publishing Data Not Given.

2) Fox, Robert S., School Climate Improvement: A Challenge To The School Administrator, Phi Delta Kappan, 1973.

3) Garrett, Henry E., PH.D. and Woodworth, R.S., Statistics In Psychology and Education, David McKay Company, Inc., 1962

4) Herson, Lionel and Berg, Ian, Out of School Modern Perspectives In Truancy and School Refusal, New York: 1980.

5) Neill, Shirley Bowes: American Association Of School Adminstrators, Critical Issues Report - Keeping Students In School, Problems and Solutions, Berlingame, Califo, 1979.

6) Williams, Ronnie L.: Boone County Dropout Research Project - Part 1, (1983 Revised 1984).

COMPUTER SOFTWARE

Micor Soft Corporation, Multi Plan

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The study shall now pursue findings directed toward early detection factors common to school dropouts. The dropout problem in America has become a relatively new phenomenon. According to Dr. Robert Zeller approximately eighty-five to ninety per cent (85-90%) of all students entering high schhol left school before graduation. During the last fifty years the numbers of dropouts have been reduced to approximately forty percent (40%) (1) (2). The percentage decrease appears very impressive until one considers the total implications of this situation. One must remember that at the turn of the century high school education was considered a luxury rather than a necessity. Many school teachers possessed a temporary teaching certificate with an eighth grade education.

During the last fifty years an individual is required to possess a high school diploma to work in a fast food restaurant, run a cash register or even dig ditches. The educational institutions of America have had demands placed on them to make sure the forty percent (40%) of the school leavers become productive citizens, and will be able to contribute to their existence. According to the National Education Association, "Automation has drastically increased the need for educating people with adaptable skills and has, at the same time, displaced many people with obsolete skills or inadequate education. While professional and technical positions remain unfilled, citizens

with little or no education have increasing difficulty in an economy in which 5 percent (5%) of the jobs are unskilled and even most routine job require a high school diploma."(2)

AGE/GRADE CORRELATION TO DROPOUTS

According to the West Virginia Dropout Report for 1981-82 approximately 95 percent (95%) of the student dropouts occur at the compulsory school age of sixteen years of age. The state dropout report also related the fact that 3 percent (3%) dropped out by the age of seventeen years of age. One could therefore conclude that West Virginia loses approximately 98 percent (98%) of their dropouts before they attain eighteen (18) years of age.

Since the study groups will be derived from Boone County, the Boone County statistics are relative. Approximately 51 percent (51%) of the student dropouts occur at the compulsory school age of sixteen (16) years of age. Boone County also loses 25 percent (25%) of dopouts during their seventeenth year. One may conclude that Boone County loses 76 percent (76%) of dropout before they attain eighteen years of age.(3)

The statistics previously relating to the maximum compulsory eductaion age or the age at which students are legally permitted to drop out in the United States range from no compulsory education law to mandatory school attendance to eighteen years of age or graduation. Cervantes concludes "The average maximum age of compulsory education is sixteen years of age."(4)

STUDENT RETENTION AND IT'S RELATIONSHIP TO DROPOUTS

Retention significantly relates to potential dropouts. According to Wall, Schonell and Olson, failure is a relative term and much depends upon the definitions utilized to adequately prescribe educational philosophies and notions that constitute educational growth. "Next to the home, the school plays the most important part in the child's development. During adolescence school becomes more important, not merely in the acquisition of formal attainments, but in broader educational growth and in shaping the personality."(5)

According to Cervantes, the dropout feels that he does not belong. He does not belong because he or she has been retained in school and thus separated from his age mates: he does not belong because his communication aptitudes verbal and social seem truncated.(6) Cervantes conducted a study of dropouts and found the following facts to be true. He found that dropouts tend to have a higher retention rate in the earlier grades. This fact was substantiated by the National School Public Relations Association that over 32 percent (32%) of the dropouts studied in Colorado had been retained one year.(7)

The West Virginia dropout data sheet revealed that 65 percent (65%) of all dropouts have been retained at least one year. Cervantes believes retention in school decreases school participation, parental interest, and peer interaction. This dropout specialist believes that the circumstances that occur due to retention are the basic factors to encourage school withdraw. Cervantes stressed the fact that a student who is retained has first lost an interest in his academic success because he is unable to complete the minimum class expectations.

The second factor which contributes to student discontent is the separation from his peers. Even though he has been retained, the likelihood of his future success is greatly hampered by the previously mentioned factors along with being grouped with younger children who can readily master their class assignments and further frustrates the student who is experiencing academic failure.(8) A study conducted by the National Public Relations found that 30.7 percent (30.7%) of the 1968-1969 dropouts were retained one year as compared to 6.2 percent (6.2%) of the 1968-1969 graduates.(9) One therefore could conclude from sheer numbers that retention has a direct influence on school dropouts.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN RELATION TO DROPOUTS

As Cervantes states in his book The Dropout "Those who have an interest do not drop out of school. The students who have a positive interest inevitably complete high school."(10) According to a study conducted by the National School Public Relations Association 32.0 percent (32%) of dropouts experienced below average scholastic apptitude in relation to 6.7 percent (6.7%) of graduates. The dropouts experienced below average or very low reading ability at a rate of 50.7 percent (50.7%) as compared to 11.8 percent (11.8%) by graduates.(11)

Hersov, found only two items of discrimination between the children who disliked school and their more favorably disposed peers. The one which showed the most consistent relationship to attitude was, as perhaps might be expected, lacks interest in school work. Such lack of interest was reported of only 2 percent (2%) of girls and 3 percent (3%) of boys who liked school very much and 5 and 8 percent (5% and 8%) respectively of those who liked school as much as most children. Among the children who disliked school however, 21 percent (21%) of boys, and 12 percent (12%) of girls fell into the 'uninterested' category, a marked and statistically significant difference.(12)

Hersov also evaluated students on academic levels. The results were in relation to boys and girls. The dislike of going to school of male students who are academically above average is 54 percent (54%). The dislike of going to school of female students who are academically above average is 10 percent (10%), average 48 percent (48%) and below average is 43 percent (43%).(13) The evidence revealed in this study suggest that, among females, the dislike of school does not manifest iteself so obviously as in actual behavior as it does among boys.

Hirschi (1969), argues that school failure affects the commitment of the adolescent to the school, and Frease (1972) believes that failure affects adolescent self perceptions. Further supportive evidence is produced by Stinchcombe's (1964) study of school rebellion and British evidence of Little (1977), found that '...social factors cause poor performance which in turn may generate maladjustment; furthermore, regardless of social factors, poor educational performance is seen as a cause rather than a consequence of maladjustment.(14)

A study conducted by Georgia's vocational educational department found that irregular school attendance has a direct coorelation with the potential of becoming a dropout. The study also concluded that irregular attendance had a direct correlation with repeated student failure. According to Coordinated Vocational Academic Education (CVAE) Program, "students who can experience success instead of failure, become interested in learning and develop positive attitudes towards themselves, work, other people and their total environment. The CVAE program has been successful in a number of areas, including reducing the chronic absentee rate of students in school. The average student attendance improvement was 25 percent (25%) over the previous fiscal year. The statistics revealed the average student participating in the CVAE program entered on an average of four grade levels below norm. After one year in the program, the average student academic improvement was 1.5 years.(15)

A project conducted at Ossining High School located in the New York City School System yielded surprising data. The project was implemented due to financing being curtailed due to a low student retention rate. The dropout rate ranged from an alarming 25 percent (25%) to a whooping

50 percent (50%) in schools located in the urban center. Their first attempt to correct this drastic situation was the establishment of an alternative school. The school was first designed to accomodate the high risk children who had been expelled from high school. The first attempt was a total disaster due to poor attendance and assaults on teachers. The school officials decided to restructure their approach. The program addressed four major strategies: (1) teacher/staff inservice training, (2) alternative academic programs for high-risk potential dropouts, (3) training students at social and interpersonal skills, and (4) family intervention training.

The success rendered by the project was evident after three years. "The school dropout rate decreased from 6.04 percent (6.04%) in 1977 to 3.30 percent (3.30%) in 1980. The dropout rate for the high-risk dropout in the experimental program was 3 percent (3%); similarly identified students in the control group, who received no treatment, had a dropout rate of 32 percent (32%).

The absence rate for the students in the treatment programs decreased by 16 percent (16%); the students in the control group had an increase of 42 percent (42%). The failure rate for students in the treatment group decreased by 52 percent (52%). Students in the control group had an increase of 16 percent (16%). School suspensions dropped by 71 percent (71%) from the year prior to the start of the project.(16) The author concluded that a dramatic success factor will be realized when the students experience success, parents become supportive, and the total school staff is happy.

Mahood was quick to point out that when success in school seems far from reality, removing oneself from the setting in which failure occurs seems reasonable, almost compelling.(17)

STUDENT ABSENTEEISM IN RELATION TO DROPOUTS

Sentelle believes truancy should be treated as a sympton. He believes, "As a student misses classes, school work suffers, and a new problem is added to the student's other troubles. The more classes missed, the more the student falls behind, and the harder it becomes to return to class."(18) Mr. Sentelle concluded that the very structure and organization of the secondary program has a tendency to encourage truancy. The traditional secondary educational program is organized by departments and subjects. A student may therefore have six different teachers of which he is one of one hundred fifty students. A student can all too easily, often willfully, become lost in the crowd.

Mr. Sentelle concluded that a truancy program needs to emphasie the individual. If a student has only one teacher, he or she is less tempted to miss class, or hedge on his assignments. The truant should remain in the special corrective program until an obvious pattern of regular attendance is evident. Research reveals that many truant students returned to class ahead of their classmates. Sometimes, despite the special attention and encouragement to continue, a student drops out of school altogether.

Lauri John Hakanen, who instituted The Stride Program was faced with a serious problem that involved ninth and tenth grade students, whose negative feelings toward school resulted in a very high rate of absenteeism and poor academic performance. The basic thrust of this program was to turn potential dropouts back on to school. The Stride Program yielded data which concluded that students attended school more regularly when they were in a classroom setting that was on their academic level. The students also developed a positive attitude toward

themselves and their academic achievements: A large percentage of the students were successfully mainstreamed into the regular school setting within a year. The study revealed that students adjusted to the academic change and their grades as well as attendance continued to be above expectations.

Hinkley concluded that an Alternative School helps potential dropouts remain in school. The Dropout Prevention program was instituted to provide a curriculum that meets the needs of the students, as well as involves the parents in the correction of their child's academic problems. The program results yielded the following data: "The suspension rate was cut in half, there was a ten percent increase in attendance, within three months students realized a 1.4 grade level increase in their reading scores, and a .6 grade level increase in their math scores."(19)

Rossain concluded his writings that early detection factors in identifying potential dropouts by "1) a record of truancy or excessive absence from class, 2) a low level of identification with or participation in school activities, 3) low or failing grades, 4) difficulty in communicating with teachers and other students; and 5) little interest in classroom work."(20) Ross also found that students who participated in the program were truant an average of 17 class hours as compared with 96.5 class hours for students not enrolled in the program. The study also revealed one dropout for the students in the program as compared to seven students in the control group.(21)

Lotto in the article identified the most frequent indicators used in dropout detection. The indicator most frequencly used was low achievement, usually one or two years below grade norms. Average

students, students failing more than one course, and students with low levels of proficiency in basic skills were all viewed as likely dropouts. Poor attendance was also used to indicate likely dropouts, but this was never the sole criterion for prediction.(22) The author was explicit in stating the fact that not one indicator is an effective predictor in itself but all are conjunctively related.

Donald L. Martin, Jr., compiled a research report to identify potential dropouts. The research found thirty two indicators that were directly related to dropouts and persistors. Thirty two of the fifty one variables were found to have a significant relationship to a student dropping out of school.

The identifiable variables are:

1. Dropouts were more likely than persisters to be living in a broken home.
2. The educational level of dropouts' fathers was less than the educational level of persisters' fathers.
3. The educational level of dropouts' mothers was less than the educational level of persisters' mothers.
4. Fathers of dropouts ranked lower than persisters' fathers on Duncan's Occupational Status Scale.
5. Mothers of dropouts ranked lower than persisters' mothers on Duncan's Occupational Status Scale.
6. Dropouts were more likely to come from lower income families than persisters.
7. Dropouts generally came from larger families than persisters.
8. Dropouts had more older siblings than persisters ("Position in family" variable).
9. Dropouts had more older siblings who dropped out of school than persisters had.
10. Families of dropouts owned fewer cars than families of persisters

11. Families of dropouts were less likely to own their own home than families of persisters.

12. Dropouts' fathers were less likely to be involved in school-related organizations than persisters' fathers.

13. Dropouts were more likely than persisters to be white males.

14. Dropouts were less likely than persisters to have attended kindergarten.

15. Dropouts were retained more often than persisters.

16. Dropouts were over-age for their grade when they left school.

17. Dropouts had lower average IQ scores than persisters.

18. Dropouts had lower average reading stanine scores in elementary school (grades 1-6) as well as in junior high and high school (grades 7-12) than persisters.

19. Dropouts were absent more often in every grade than persisters.

20. Dropouts participated in school-sponsored extracurricular activities for fewer grades in junior high school than persisters.

21. Dropouts participated in school-sponsored extracurricular activities for fewer grades during their entire school career than persisters.

22. Dropouts participated in outside of school activities for fewer grades in junior high school than persisters.

23. Dropouts participated less in outside activities during their entire school career than persisters.

24. Dropouts drove a car to school during more grades than persisters.

25. Dropouts worked more hours per week on a farm than persisters.

26. Dropouts worked more hours per week on a non-farm than persisters.

27. Dropouts were sent to the principal's office for misbehavior during more grades in junior high school than persisters.

28. Dropouts were sent to the principal's office for misbehavior during more grades in their entire school career than persisters.

29. Dropouts disliked school during more grades in junior high school than persisters.

30. Dropouts disliked school during more grades in their entire school career than persisters.

31. Dropouts did not get along well with teachers during more grades in junior high school than persisters.

32. Dropouts did not get along well with teachers during more grades in their entire school career than persisters.(23)

Fox and Elder found that, "...potential dropouts can be identified as early as the sixth grade. Indicators of a potential drop-out are: poor grades, poor attendance, lack of involvement in school activities, and family history."(24)

Rita E. Underwood in her "Dropout Turnaround" through ESEA Title IV, Part C, made a statement concerning dropouts that was, and shall remain very impressive throughout this study. She wrote, "School dropouts, whether they be in-school dropouts or not, should not be seen as those who are problems, but as those who have problems."(25)

-SUMMARY-

One could conclude from the research that dropouts do follow a prescribed pattern and can be identified before they become statistics. The problem of how to prevent dropouts remains unsolved. Although research shows some effective solutions, much more research is needed.

FOOTNOTES

1) Zeller, Robert: "Lowering the Odds of Student Dropouts"

2) "No Room at the Bottom", p. 1-2 National Education Association

3) West Virginia Dropout Study; 1981 - 1982

4) Cervantes, Lucius Ferdinand, The Dropout p. 60

5) Wall, W. D., Schonell, F. J., and Olson, W. C.: "Failure in School" p. 1-2

6) Cervantes, Lucius, Ferdinand, The Dropout, p. 102

7) National School Public Relations Association: Dropouts: Prevention and Rehabilitation, p. 7

8) Cervantes, Lucius Ferdinand: The Dropout, pp. 68-77

9) National School Public Relations Association: Dropout: Prevention and Rehabilitation, p. 7

10) Cervantes, Lucius Ferdinand: The Dropout, p. 78

11) National School Public Relations Association: Dropout: Prevention and Rehabilitation, p. 7

12) Hersov, Lionel: Out of School, p. 12

13) Hersov, Lionel: Out of School, p. 13

14) Hersov, Lionel: Out of School, p. 91

15) Vocational Education: Site Report #2, pp. 40-41

16) Maurer, Richard E.: Dropout Prevention: An Intervention Model for Today's High Schools, Phi Delta Kappan , pp. 470-471

17) Mahood, Wayne: Born Losers: School Dropouts and Pushouts, N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin pp. 56-57

18) Sentelle, Sam P.: A Helping Hand for the Chronic Truant, Educational Leadership, p. 471

19) Hinkley, Ed: An Instructional Program for Dropouts, N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, pp. 63-64

20) Ross, Victor J.: Find Potential Dropouts Early, Then Help Them Stay in School, Executive Educator, p. 16

21) Ross, Victor J.: Find Potential Dropouts Early, Then Help Them Stay in School, Executive Educator, p. 17

22) Lotto, Linda S.: The Holding Power of Vocational Curricula: Characteristics of Effective Dropout Prevention Programs, Journal of Vocational Education Research, p. 41

23) Martin, Donald L., Jr.: Identifying Potential Dropouts: A Research Report, pp. 7-9

24) Fox, William M.: Elder, Nancy: A Study of Practices and Policies for Discipline and Dropouts in Ten Selected Schools, p. 5

25) Underwood, Rita E.: Dropout Turnaround Through ESEA Title IV, Part C, p. 5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOK

Cervantes, Lecius Ferdinand: The Dropout
The University of Michigan Press, 1965

Hersor, Lionel: Berg, Ian: Out of School,
John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1980

National School Public Relations Association:
Dropouts: Prevention and Rehabilitation, 1978

Neill, Shirley Bows: Keeping Students in School,
A.A.S.A. Sacramento, California, 1979

Schrieber, Daniel: Profile of the School Dropout,
Random House, New York, 1967

Tannenbaum, Abraham J.: Dropout or Diploma,
Teachers College Press, New York, 1966

Wall, William Douglas, Schonell, F. J., and Olson, W. C.:
No Room at the Bottom, National Education Association, 1963

Zeller, Robert Dr.: Lowering the Odds on Student Dropouts,
Prentice-Hall, 1966

PERIODICAL

Easer, John M.; Vaupel, Carl F. Jr.: Inservice for Countering
the Dropout Problem, Journal of the International Association
of Pupil Personnel Workers, Volume 25, No. 2, Fall 1981

Hakanen, Lauri John: The Stride Program: An Answer to Absenteeism,
Phi Delta Kappan, Volume 59, No. 5, January 1978

Bibliography Continued

Hinkley, Ed: An Instructional Program for Dropouts, N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Volume 63, No. 424, February 1979

Lotto, Linda S.: The Holding Power of Vocational Curricula: Characteristics of Effective Dropout Prevention Programs, Journal of Vocational Education Research, Volume 7, No. 4, Fall 1982

Mahood, Wayne: Born Losers: School Dropouts and Pushouts, N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Volume 65, No. 441, January 1981

Martin, Donald L., Jr.: Identifying Potential Dropouts: A Research Report, Kentucky State Department of Education Frankfort, Kentucky, Office of Research and Planning, February 1981

Maurer, Richard E.: Dropout Prevention: An Intervention Model for Today's High Schools, Phi Delta Kappan, January 1980

Robbins, Jeffrey: Alternative Programs: Sometimes They Work, Sometimes They Don't, N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, Volume 65, No. 445, May 1981

Ross, Victor J.: Find Potential Dropouts Early, Then Help Them Stay in School, Executive Educator, Volume 5, No. 6, June 1983

Sentelle, Sam P.: A Helping Hand for the Chronic Truant, Educational Leadership, Volume 37, No. 6, March 1980

Silverman, Stuart: Project Focus: A Program for the Alienated, Clearing House, Volume 52, No. 2, October 1978

Vocational Education: Site Report #2: Georgia's Winning Way with Alienated Youth, Volume 54, No. 3, March 1979, Author Not Given

Research Documents

Fox, William M.: Elder, Nancy: A Study of Practices and Policies for Discipline and Dropouts in Ten Selected Schools, February 1980

Kaesey, Susan C.: Hooper, Paula K.: Seventh and Eighth Grade Dropouts in Ohio: Research on Who They Are, Why They Leave and How School Districts Count Them, Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, April 1983

Norris, Carol A.: Chan, Susy S.: Bostrom Alternative Center for Education: Intum Evaluation Report, Phoenix Union High School District, Arizona, April 1979

Underwood, Rita E.: Dropout Turnaround Through ESEA Title IV, Part C, Department of Education, Washington, D.C. October 1980

West Virginia Dropout Report, 1981 - 1982, West Virginia Department of Education, Charleston, West Virginia 1982

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Chapter III

Organization of the Study

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Organization of the Study

A strategically organized study was structured to offer a vivid comparison between dropouts and a control group of graduates. The study was designed to address the early detection factors common to school dropouts. The following procedures were utilized to substantiate the eight hypotheses introduced in Chapter one. The study provoked the scanning of two areas of related research.

The West Virginia Dropout Summary Reports for the 1982-1983 and the 1983-1984 school terms were utilized to secure the statistics necessary to verify the hypothesis that asignificantly larger prercentage of students will terminate their school affiliation at, or during their sixteenth year of age. The state summary is very thorough in that it involves the state, county, and local statistical data concerning the dropouts age at which school attendance is terminated. This information is compiled on a state computer data analysis sheet.

The county dropout study addressed the student dropout age as compiled from the county survey samples. The sampling population was inclusive of one hundred dropouts. Random sampling techniques were utilized to assure valid statistical results.

The accurate age at which the dropout samples terminated their school attendance could be identified in eighty-five of the selected samples. The samples were compiled and an average was computed. The compilation of the sample data utilized in this section of the study was derived from the individual dropouts' permanent record cards. This technique was utilized to insure valid statistical calculations.

The hypothesis concerning the number of dropouts who have repeated at least one grade during their school tenure needs to be reviewed. The West Virginia Department of Education's Dropout Summary Reports for the 1982-1983 and the 1983-1984 school terms will be utilized to substantiate this premise or prove it totally unsound. The West Virginia Dropout Summary Report is compiled by fifty-five individual county dropout reports and the state, county, and individual school statistical data are rendered on computer data analysis sheets.

The county dropout study will utilize a questionnaire that specifically addresses the number of dropouts retained at least one year. The county study also addressed the same questionnaire to a control group sample of graduates. The sampling group consists of one hundred dropouts and fifty graduates. The valid sampling group consisted of eighty-nine dropouts and forty-nine graduates. There were eleven dropouts and one graduate that did not possess the valid information to properly establish the fact of retention.

The statistical information concerning student retentions in relation to the sample of dropouts and graduates addressed in the county study was secured from the student permanent record cards. This technique was utilized to insure accurate information utilization in data compilation. The hypotheses in consideration at this stage of the study are: 1) a high percentage of dropouts tend to repeat at least one grade during their school tenure, and 2) the control group of graduates will repeat fewer grades than the sample group of dropouts.

The county study will establish a correlation between low test scores in the areas of English, Math, and Social Studies and the potential to drop out of school. The study will substantiate this

premise through data derived from the 1982-1983, and 1983-1984, West Virginia Department of Education's Dropout Summary Report as well as a county dropout study. The information rendered from the state dropout study was derived from individual state public school dropout notification sheets that are compiled on a computer data analysis sheet.

The county dropout study sample addressed a random sample of one hundred dropouts and a control group sample of forty nine graduates. Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (C.T.B.S.) data derived from the individual sample's permanent record folder addressed the areas of reading, mathematics, and social studies, for comparative purposes. The performance level in each subject area was derived by subtracting the grade equivalence performance, in each subject area, from the grade level at which the testing was administered. Example: a reading equivalence of 9.7 and the test was administered when the student was at the 8.2 grade level. Therefore, the student would receive a reading score of one year and five months (+1.5) above grade level. The same student might have received a social studies grade equivalence score of 6.9 grade level. The student would receive a one year and three months (-1.3) below grade level in the area of social studies.

The scores were averaged in regard to the respective subject areas as well as individual total performance averages. An overall average was computed along with the standard deviation on the Multi Plan computer software. The significant difference was computed in relation to the formula given in chapter one.

IRREGULAR SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND DROPOUTS

Irregular school attendance and the potential of becoming a dropout, the attendance section of the 1982-1983, 1983-1984 West Virginia Department of Education's Dropout Summary Report and a county dropout study were utilized to either validate of nulify the premise that school attendance has a direct effect one one's becoming a potential dropout.

The attendance data secured for the county dropout study was derived from the dropouts' and graduates' permanent record folders. The data were compiled from a sample of one hundred dropouts and a control group of fifty graduates. A thorough analysis of the random sample narrowed the study group to eighty-five dropouts and forty-nine graduates. The sample reduction was necessitated because an accurate sample analysis could not be secured.

Attendance averages were compiled for grade one (1) through grade eleven (11). The calculations were secured for dropouts as well as the control group of graduates. The graduate's twelfth year attendance was not calculated to prevent an unusual lowering of the days present per year. Therefore, when the data comparison occurs in Chapter 4, the samples of dropouts and graduates will be equal.

FREQUENCY OF COURT APPEARANCE IN RELATION TO DROPOUTS

Juvenile and adult court appearances tend to be higher for dropouts than for the control group of graduates. The instruments utilized to secure the court case statistics were the annual juvenile conviction listings. The listings give the individual's name, first name, and middle initial. Each listing is alphabetical, with the court case number and the date on which the conviction was rendered. The two juvenile court case listings represented the calendar years 1977 to 1980 and 1981 to 1984. The listings encompass approximately six and one-half years of convictions.

The adult listings of court convictions in the 25th Judicial Circuit were secured from the entire adult files. The sample group encompases one hundred fifty seven (157) dropouts from the 1980-1981 school year. This sample was utilized because it includes only the dropout samples that could be considered as adults by the judicial system, in that they are eighteen years of age.

The control group sample of graduates include one hundred graduates, both male and female. The control sample was secured from the graduates in the 1981-1982 and 1982-1983 school years. As with the dropouts, the total adult conviction files of West Virginia's 25th Circuit Court were utilized to statistically compare the number of graduates and their judicial records.

FAMILY EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF DROPOUTS

The area of related research has prompted an analysis of the educational levels of the dropout families as compared to the control group, the graduate families. A sample of one hundred dropouts' permanent record folders yielded twenty-seven (27) accurate samples that gave the educational levels of the dropout's mother and father. The control group of fifty (50) graduates yielded forty-six (46) samples that gave the educational levels of the graduate's mother and father.

The dropout and graduate family educational level calculations of the average and standard deviation were calibrated on the Multi Plan software. The significant difference was derived by the utilization of one statistical formula given in Chapter One.

FAMILY OCCUPATIONS OF DROPOUTS

The area of related research prompted an analysis of family occupations. The dropout sample included one hundred individuals and a control group sample of fifty graduates. The occupational information was secured from the samples' permanent record folders. The dropout sample rendered a sample of thirty-five and the control group of graduates produced a sample of forty-six. The questionnaire had seven occupational categories. The categories were broken down into male and female divisions.

The areas considered were: 1) professional workers, 2) skilled workers, 3) unskilled workers, 4) unemployed, 5) retired, 6) disabled, and 7) unknown. The professional workers included any persons who had received formal educational training to perform their specific job task.

Examples included educational instructors, accountants, formally trained store managers, and administrators. The skilled classification includes persons receiving training to perform their job trask that could not be completed without their specific training. Such trade skills include machinist, bus operators, word processor operators, welders, and professional secretaries.

The unskilled classification includes such skills as housewife, custodian, and fast-food employee. The unemployed classification would include an individual who is physically and mentally capable of particip-tion in the job market but who is not gainfully employed. The retired classification included any parent sample who has accrued enough service time with an employer to qualify for retirement benefits. The sample may have only enough employment time to qualify for governmental retirement benefits.

The disabled sample includes any individual who has a physical or mental impairment that eliminates them from being gainfully employed in the standard work force. This category would include individuals who could not be successful in vocational rehabilitation training. The final category is unknown. The only incident that would justify the utilization of the category would be if one or both parents' occupation could be designated as unknown on the sample's permanent record folder. A folder with no employment designation would not qualify in this category.

CONCLUSION

The organization of this study was so designed to address all hypotheses stated in Chapter one. The study was organized to retrieve concrete factual data from the West Virginia Department of Education's Annual Dropout Reports. This data gave an overview of state, county, as well as individual school performance in the areas of early detection factors of dropouts. The county dropout study utilized a sampling group of one hundred (100) dropouts and a control group sample of fifty (50) graduates. The data was rertrieved from the sampling group's permanent record cards. The averages and standard deviations were computed on the Multi Plan computer software. The significant differences in the respective areas was computed by the formulas presented in Chapter one.

LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

Research Documents

Boone County's Dropout Data Sheet, 1984

Boone County's Graduate Data Sheet, 1984

West Virginia Department of Education, Dropout Survey 1982-1983 and 1983-1984

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

CHAPTER IV
Analysis of Research

Table of Contents

Charts
Utilized

	Chart #	Page #
Academic Performance of Dropouts	#DD-1	57
	#DD-2	58
	#DD-3	59
School Attendance of Dropouts	#DD-4	61
	#DD-5	62
	#DD-6	63
	#DD-7	64
Family Grade Completion of Dropouts	#DD-8	67
	#DD-9	68
	#DD-10	69
	#DD-11	70
Parental Occupations of Dropouts	#DD-12	72
	#DD-13	73

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH RESULTS RELATED TO EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

The analysis of research is an intricate factor in the accurate statistical results in identifying the early detection factors common to the potential dropout. The crucial factor in research analysis is the statistically accurate calculations of the prescribed areas being researched.

The research analysis will be evaluated in direct coorelation with the hypotheses listed in chapter one. The area pertaining to the age at which students drop out of school will be addressed. According to the 1982-1983 West Virginia Dropout Report Summary, 49.67% all state dropouts were sixteen (16) years of age or younger. The county summary reported 56.06% of the dropouts were sixteen (16) years of age or younger. The dropouts statewide that were seventeen (17) years of age or younger were 78.21% on the state level and 91.51% on the county summary.(1)

The 1983-1984 dropout summary reported an overall state dropout rate of sixteen (16) years of age or younger at 45.77% and the county dropout summary of sixteen yers of age or younger was 39.95%.(2) One of the interesting facts revealed in the county research analysis was in 1982-83 school year 91.57% dropped out of school on or before their seventeenth birthday, in the 1983-1984 school year 77.91% of all county dropouts were seventeen years of age or younger.(3)

The county dropout study sample analysis produced 60.11% of all county students dropped out on or before their sixteenth birthday and 97.64% dropped out on or before their seventeenth birthday. The data compilation clearly reveals the county dropouts at the age of sixteen tends to be slightly higher than the state average. The county dropout survey was 10.44% to 21.16% higher than the state-county summary. The analysis also addressed dropouts at the age of 17 years or younger. The state dropout analysis on dropouts seventeen years of age and younger was for 1982-1983, 78.21% and 1983-1984, 73.04%. The county research data concluded a 97.64% of the dropouts terminate their attendance on or before their seventeenth birthday. This data analysis addressing dropouts seventeen years of age and younger had a percentage differentiation of 19.43% to 24.60%. The reason for this significant percentage difference is that the county samples were selected from dropouts in the last thirty years. The 1982-1983 and 1983-1984 dropout reports clearly indicate a trend in the age at which students drop out of school. This data analysis would justify the significant percentage differentiation.

RETENTION RATE OF DROPOUTS

The analysis of dropouts who have repeated at least one grade during their schooling will be analyzed. The sample of one hundred dropouts rendered an accurate sampling of eighty nine dropouts. This group produced fifty one students who were retained. The percentage of dropout retentions was calculated at 57.30%. The state dropout report rendered 54.37% of all dropouts were retained.(1) The control sample

of forty nine rendered two graduates retained during their school tenure. The calculation analysis produced a 4.08% of graduates were retained. The data analization produced a distinctive 53.22% retention difference between the dropouts and graduates.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF DROPOUTS

The research addressing academic performance included one hundred dropout samples and forty nine of the fifty control group samples of graduates. A comparative data analysis provided the following information. Dropouts in the area of reading two years and two months below grade level as compared to four months above grade level by the control group of graduates. The area of mathematics provided a two year and three month performance deficit by dropouts as compared to a two month above grade level performance by the control group. The area of social studies provided a two year and five month deficit performance by dropouts as compared to a four month above grade level score rendered by the control group. The overall academic performance sample rendered an average two year three months below grade level performance by the dropouts and the standard deviation of the scores was 2.3. The graduates' overall academic average was three months above grade level with a standard deviation of 1.2.

DISTRICT [illegible] GTES TEST RESULTS

DD-1

UNIT TITLE	GRADE TEST COMPLETED	READING	MATHEMATICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	TOTAL	AVERAGE
[illegible]	8.8	-3.9	-3.1	-5.4	-12.4	-4.2
[illegible]	9.2	-1.4	-1.0	-1.7	-4.1	-1.4
[illegible]	9.2	-1.6	-1.1	-2.7	-5.4	-1.9
[illegible]	9.2	-1.2	-1.2	-0.5	-2.9	-1.0
[illegible]	9.2	0.0	-0.7	0.0	-0.7	-0.2
AM17	7.1	-3.4	-2.6	-3.4	-9.4	-3.1
AM18	9.2	-2.1	-1.5	-1.8	-5.4	-1.8
AM19	8.2	-1.0	-1.5	-1.4	-3.9	-1.3
AM111	11.2	1.1	-0.7	0.3	0.7	0.2
AM112	8.2	-4.8	-5.1	-6.0	-15.1	-5.0
AM1C	11.1	-0.5	1.1	1.1	1.7	0.6
AM114	9.1	-2.1	-1.2	-3.7	-7.0	-2.3
AM115	9.7	-1.9	-0.4	-4.1	-6.4	-2.1
AM1c	8.1	-5.1	-1.7	-5.8	-12.6	-4.2
AM117	9.1	-2.3	-2.4	-4.0	-9.3	-3.1
AM116	9.1	-4.8	-4.1	-7.4	-15.7	-5.2
AM119	8.1	-7.2	-6.9	-7.4	-21.5	-7.2
AM1C0	11.1	-9.2	-9.2	-9.1	-27.5	-9.2
AM121	8.1	-6.4	-1.8	-8.2	-15.4	-5.2
AM122	9.1	-6.8	-7.2	-8.9	-22.1	-7.4
AF2[illegible]	11.1	-6.9	-7.9	-5.9	-20.7	-6.9
AF25	6.1	-1.6	-1.7	-1.2	-4.7	-1.6
AF26	9.2	-1.1	-1.4	-1.9	-4.4	-1.5
AF27	9.2	-0.5	-0.4	-2.1	-3.0	-1.0
AF2E	9.2	-1.1	-1.3	-1.3	-3.7	-1.2
AF30	9.2	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	-3.3	-1.1
AF31	9.2	-1.0	-1.3	-1.3	-3.6	-1.2
AF33	9.2	1.1	-2.7	1.1	-0.5	-0.2
AF34	9.2	-0.5	-1.7	-4.4	-6.6	-2.2
AF3[illegible]	6.2	0.1	-1.1	0.3	-0.7	-0.2
AF37	9.2	-1.4	-1.4	-1.0	-4.0	-1.4
AF3[illegible]	9.1	-7.4	-7.6	-7.4	-22.4	-7.5
AF40	9.2	-0.5	-0.4	-1.0	-1.9	-0.6
E141	6.7	-2.1	-2.1	-1.6	-5.8	-1.9
E142	8.6	-3.7	-3.9	-2.9	-10.5	-3.5
E143	8.6	-4.6	-3.7	-5.3	-13.6	-4.5
E1[illegible]4	7.6	0.2	-1.4	-0.9	-2.1	-0.7
E146	8.6	-3.5	-3.9	-4.9	-12.3	-4.1
E147	7.6	-3.6	-3.6	-1.6	-8.8	-2.9
E149	9.1	-6.2	-7.6	-5.2	-19.0	-6.3
E150	7.6	-4.1	-3.4	-3.2	-10.7	-3.6
E151	8.6	-2.9	-1.9	-1.9	-6.7	-2.2
E152	7.1	-4.8	-3.5	-4.2	-11.7	-3.9
E153	8.6	1.6	-0.6	0.8	1.8	0.6
E154	8.6	4.3	0.6	3.4	8.3	2.8
E155	8.6	-3.4	-1.7	-0.6	-5.7	-1.9
E157	7.6	-3.0	-4.6	-5.6	-12.8	-4.8
E159	6.7	-2.2	-2.2	-1.6	-6.0	-2.0
E160	8.6	-3.1	-6.6	-6.5	-16.2	-5.4
E161	9.1	-3.7	-2.5	-4.7	-10.9	-3.6
E162	7.6	-2.0	-4.0	-2.1	-8.1	-2.7
E163	8.6	-5.1	-5.6	-3.9	-14.6	-4.9
E164	6.7	-1.3	-1.5	-0.9	-3.7	-1.2
E165	7.6	-0.1	-3.1	-0.4	-3.6	-1.2
E166	8.6	-1.7	-1.1	-1.4	-4.2	-1.4
E16[illegible]	8.6	1.0	-0.7	1.7	2.0	0.7
EF68	8.6	-0.3	-3.3	-0.1	-3.7	-1.2
EF69	7.6	-0.3	-2.1	-1.9	-4.3	-1.4
EF7E	8.6	-4.3	-5.3	-4.9	-14.5	-4.8
EF71	8.6	-4.6	-4.0	-4.2	-13.0	-4.4
EF72	8.6	-4.9	-3.4	-4.6	-12.9	-4.3
EF73	8.6	-4.1	-4.4	-4.6	-13.1	-4.4
EF74	8.6	-0.9	-2.0	1.2	-1.7	-0.6
EF75	7.6	-3.2	-4.6	-5.1	-12.9	-4.3
EF76	9.1	-5.1	-2.4	-5.1	-12.6	-4.2
EF77	8.6	-3.7	-5.2	-4.6	-13.3	-4.4
EF78	7.6	-1.4	1.1	2.2	1.9	0.6
EF79	7.6	-4.1	2.6	-2.4	-3.9	-1.3
EF6[illegible]	7.6	1.3	-0.7	-2.4	-1.8	-0.6
EF81	8.6	-5.1	-5.6	-6.6	-17.3	-5.8
EF82	7.6	2.6	-0.3	2.7	5.0	1.7
EF83	11.1	-4.8	-4.0	-4.3	-12.3	-4.1
EF84	8.6	-0.5	-0.8	-0.4	-1.7	-0.6
EF85	8.6	-1.2	-0.7	-2.6	-4.5	-1.5
EF86	8.6	-1.3	0.5	-0.6	-1.4	-0.5
EF87	8.6	-1.2	-0.9	-1.0	-3.1	-1.0
CI88	9.2	0.2	0.3	-0.4	0.1	0.0
CI89	9.2	-1.0	-1.1	-1.5	-3.6	-1.2
CI92	4.7	0.5	-1.0	1.0	0.5	0.2
CI91	9.2	-0.8	-1.5	-1.5	-3.8	-1.3
CI92	9.2	-0.7	-1.3	-1.1	-3.1	-1.0
CI93	8.2	-4.2	-1.7	-4.0	-9.9	-3.3
CF95	8.1	1.1	-2.4	-0.4	-1.7	-0.6
CF9[illegible]	6.7	-1.7	-1.4	-1.8	-5.1	-1.7
CF96	6.7	1.1	1.4	0.7	3.2	1.1
CF99	6.1	-0.2	0.6	0.7	1.3	0.4
CF100	9.2	1.4	1.1	-1.8	0.7	0.2
TOTAL		-169.7	-203.2	-220.0	-612.9	
AVERAGE		-2.2	-2.6	-2.8	-6.1	-2.3

STANDARD DEVIATION 2.3,

GRADUATE CTES TEST RESULTS

NAME CODE	GRADE TEST COMPLETED	READING	MATHEMATICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	TOTAL	AVERAGE
G1	8.0	-3.1	-3.2	-2.0	-8.3	-2.1
G2	9.1	-0.8	0.0	-0.1	-0.9	-0.3
G3	9.2	1.0	1.1		2.1	1.1
G4	9.2	1.2	-0.1		1.1	0.6
G5	9.2	1.3	0.1	0.6	1.9	0.6
G6	7.1	4.2	4.4	4.8	13.4	4.5
G7	9.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.2
G8	8.2	1.5	1.0	-0.9	1.6	0.5
G9	11.2	1.0	0.0	0.2	1.3	0.4
G10	8.2	0.2	1.2	-0.8	0.6	0.2
G11	11.1	1.1	0.1	0.9	2.1	0.7
G13	9.1	-0.6	-1.3	-0.6	-2.5	-0.8
G14	9.7	-0.3	0.1	-0.2	-0.4	-0.1
G15	8.1	1.4	-0.8	2.8	3.4	1.1
G16	8.2	2.4	1.9	3.4	7.7	2.6
G17	9.1	-0.8	-0.4	-0.4	-1.6	-0.5
G18					0.0	
G19	11.1	-0.1	-1.9	0.3	-1.7	-0.4
G20	9.2	0.0	-0.8	0.2	-0.5	-0.2
G21	9.1	-0.5	-0.5	0.1	-0.8	-0.2
G22	11.1	0.3	-1.1	-0.1	-0.9	-0.3
G23	6.1	1.5	-0.5	0.8	1.8	0.3
G24	9.2	3.0	2.5	4.2	9.7	3.2
G25	9.2	0.6	-0.2	1.5	1.6	0.5
G26	9.2	-0.9	2.1	0.0	1.2	0.4
G27	9.2	0.7	-1.5	0.6	-0.2	-0.1
G28	9.2	-0.6	0.2	-0.5	-0.9	-0.3
G29	9.2	2.9	-0.4	0.7	3.2	1.1
G30	9.2	1.4	1.1	2.4	4.9	1.6
G31	6.2	-0.4	-0.9	0.1	-1.2	-0.4
G32	9.2	0.9	0.4	2.2	3.5	1.2
G33	9.1	1.2	1.1	4.5	6.8	2.3
G34					0.0	
G35	6.7	0.0	3.1	0.9	4.0	1.3
G36	8.6	0.6	-0.5	0.3	0.4	0.1
G37	8.6	0.4	2.8	-1.4	1.8	0.6
G38	7.3	-0.7	0.8	-1.8	-1.7	-0.6
G39	8.6	0.9	0.2	0.5	1.4	0.5
G40	7.6	0.5	0.8	-0.5	0.8	0.3
G41	9.1	-1.3	-1.7	-0.3	-3.3	-1.1
G42	7.6	-0.8	-0.6	-1.1	-2.5	-0.8
G43	8.6	-1.1	0.8	-1.5	-2.6	-0.9
G44	7.1	1.5	1.3	0.4	3.2	1.1
G45	8.6	-1.4	-1.8	-1.6	-4.8	-1.3
G46	8.6	0.2	0.8	1.2	1.4	0.5
G48	8.6	-0.8	-0.5	-0.5	-1.8	-0.6
G49	7.6	-1.8	-0.5	-0.5	-2.8	-0.7
TOTAL		17.2	7.2	19.6	44.0	
AVERAGE		0.4	0.2	0.4	0.9	0.3

STANDARD DEVIATION 1.2

C. T. B. S. TEST RESULTS

	READING	MATHEMATICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	AVERAGE
DROPOUTS	-2.2	-2.3	-2.5	-2.3
GRADUATES	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.3
GRADE LEVEL PERFORMANCE DIFFERENCE	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.6

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE OF DROPOUTS

The research addressing the area of attendance performance included eighty five of the one hundred dropouts included in the sample. The control group sample analysis will address grades one through eleven. The dropouts missed an overall average of 20.8 days of school per academic year, in relation to 5.4 days absent incurred by the graduates. The individual grade attendance analysis will be located on Chart AA #1. The standard deviation of the dropout data was 11.74 as compared to the control group of graduates 3.38. The statistical calculations in relation to attendance concluded a marked significant difference of 741.3. The calculations are found on Chart #DD5 and Chart #DD6 and DD7.

ATTENDANCE ANALYSIS

DAYS ABSENT PER YEAR

GRADES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	AVERAGE
DROPOUTS	17.7	14.6	13.8	16.6	14.5	14.9	17.4	21.9	28.8	33.9	57.1	-	20.8
GRADUATES	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.3	4.4	3.4	4.8	4.7	6.8	7.0	5.8	-	5.4
DIFFERENCE IN DAYS ABSENT	12.4	9.1	8.3	11.3	10.1	11.5	12.6	17.2	22.0	26.9	51.3	-	15.4

ATTENDANCE ANALYSIS

SD DROPOUTS = 11.74 N = 85 M_1 = 153.7

SD GRADUATES = 3.30 N = 49 M_2 = 51.4

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{N_2}}$$

$$\sigma_{m_1} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} \qquad \sigma_{m_2} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$$

$$\sigma_{m_1} = \frac{11.74}{\sqrt{85}} = 1.27 \qquad \sigma_{m_2} = \frac{3.30}{\sqrt{49}} = .47$$

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{\frac{(1.27)^2}{85} + \frac{(.47)^2}{49}}$$

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{\frac{1.61}{85} + \frac{.0045}{49}}$$

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{.0189 + .00009}$$

$$\sigma_D = .138$$

$$CR = \frac{x}{o} \quad \frac{102.3}{.138} = 741.3$$

GRADUATE ATTENDANCE REPORT

DAYS ABSENT

NAME CODE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	TOT	AVE
G1			18	6	6	0	0	4	2	2	1		
G2	1	1	1	2							4		
G3	17	10	1	10	2	1	5	2	2	5	1		
G4	3	1	6	2	4	1	1	4	2	14	1		
G5	0	0	0	4	5	2	11	7	10	5	10		
G6	8	6	0	0	7	10	1	6	2	11	2		
G7	5	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	17	0		
G8						0	0	0	0	0	0		
G9	4	10	4	0	0	0	10	4	11	2	2		
G10	5	10	8	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	0		
G11	6	6	8	3	4	3	9	15	2	6	1		
G12	6	7	2	8	5	0	1	0	2	3	2		
G13	11	6	1	2	5	0	0	0	3	2	3		
G14	4	1	0	1	2	2	6	4	14	11	11		
G15	2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0		
G16	4	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2		
G17	7	7	6	9	7	16	12	10	19	11	10		
G18	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	9	19	6	0		
G19	4	4	5	1	0	3	6	3	12	4	2		
G20	12	10	0	15	9	9	11	13	15	24	12		
G21	5	17	15	14	9	0	0	0	0	6	12		
G22	7	4	16	15	11	11	13	11	16	20	10		
G23	16	9	14	16	16	0	0	15	14	12	6		
G24	7	2	0	7	7	2	2	7	24	9	10		
G25	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4	4		
G26			6	2	2	0	2	4	1	1	1		
G27									4	6	7		
G28	4	5	3	3	1	12	9	5	2	5	0		
G29	0	0	9	6	0	6	13	10	11	5	9		
G30								2	2	4	7		
G31	10	3	4	1	7	2	2	0	12	6	11		
G32							4	0	4	0	0		
G33	3	6	10	11	0	1	21	6	7	6	0		
G34										10	13		
G35						1	2	2	0	3	0		
G36	7	11	16	3	6	1	4	3	3	3	5		
G37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
G38	4	0	6	4	0	10	10	11	12	12	6		
G39	6	5	3	4	2	1	5	2	16	12	0		
G40	4	4	4	1	2	0	2	1	6	7	4		
G41	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	6		
G42	5	14	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	2		
G43	9	10	5	17	20	2	0	1	2	6	4		
G44	0	0	1	2	0	6	2	3	2	10	6		
G45	0	6	17	21	4	13	7	1	3	0	6		
G46							10	3	9	8	5		
G47	2	2	6	2	5	5	3	5	9	6	0		
G48										1	10		
G49	7	4	0	5	12	3	6	2	1	6	4		
TOTAL	287	213	226	214	176	141	283	206	311	336	203	2510	
AVERAGE	5.9	5.5	5.8	5.3	4.4	3.4	4.8	4.7	6.8	7.8	5.8	51.4	5.4

STANDARD DEVIATION 3.38

64

74

75

DD-7

COURT APPEARANCES OF DROPOUTS

The research addressing court appearances of dropouts as juveniles as well as adults will be addressed. Mr. John McMillian, Chief Probation Officer and Juvenile Referee for the 25th Judicial Circuit conducted a one year study in regard to the percentage of court appearances by both juvenile and adults in relation to the total county population. Research revealed .50% of the total county population is involved in some type of judicial litigation(2) The county research conducted for this project sampled four hundred twenty five (425) dropouts over a three year period. The juvenile court records revealed one hundred three (103) of these dropouts were found guilty of charges in judicial litigation. The total number of court appearances for the sample of dropouts numbered two hundred thirty eight (238). The research analysis statistically indicates each dropout compiled an average of 2.31 court appearances. The juvenile dropouts compiled an average of 24.23% court appearances.

The adult sample of one hundred fifty seven (157) dropouts revealed twenty three (23) were convicted as adults. The sample included students eighteen years of age. The adult dropout sample compiled an average of 14.64% court appearances.

The control group, a sample of one hundred graduates, appeared in juvenile court proceedings on two occasions and of the sample of eighteen year olds, none appeared in court proceedings as adults. The research clearly indicated that 2% of graduates appeared in juvenile court and 0% appeared as adults.

The related research addressing family grade completion will be addressed. The dropout family grade completion encompassed a sample of one hundred. There were only twenty seven accurate samples of this group. The average county dropout terminated his school tenure during his ninth year-fourth month of school. The fathers of this sample group terminated their school attendance during their seventh year-first month of school and their mothers during the eighth year-first month of school. The total family average of grade completion was the eighth year-second month. (Chart #DD11)

The control group of fifty graduates completed the twelfth grade. Their fathers on an average completed the eleventh year-first month of school and the mothers completed eleven years and five months of schooling. The overall average for the graduate family grade completion was eleven years and five months of school.

The statistical calculations to determine any significant difference (see Chart #DD9) rendered 86.67 which is an evident and marked significant difference.

FAMILY EDUCATIONAL STATUS

	STUDENT	FATHER	MOTHER	FAMILY AVERAGE
DROPOUT	9.4	7.1	8.1	8.2
GRADUATE	12.0	11.1	11.5	11.5
DIFFERENCE	2.6	4.0	3.4	3.3

GRADUATE FAMILY GRADE COMPLETION

$$SE_m = \sigma_m \quad \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$$

$$\sigma_m = \frac{1.4}{\sqrt{46}}$$

$$\sigma_m = \frac{1.4}{6.78}$$

$$\sigma_{m_1} = .206$$

DROPOUT FAMILY GRADE COMPLETION

$$SE_m = \sigma_m = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}}$$

$$\sigma_m = \frac{1.5}{\sqrt{27}}$$

$$\sigma_m = \frac{1.5}{5.196}$$

$$CR = \frac{X}{\sigma} \quad \frac{5.20}{.06} = 86.67$$

$$\sigma_{m_2} = .289$$

$$SD = OD = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2_{m1}}{N_1} + \frac{\sigma^2_{m2}}{N_2}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{(.206)^2}{46} + \frac{(.289)^2}{27}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{.0009225 + .00309} = .06$$

GRADUATE NAME CODE	FAMILY GRADE COMPLETED	FATHER	MOTHER	FAMILY AVERAGE
G1	12.0	8.0	10.0	10.7
G2	12.0	10.0	10.0	10.7
G3	12.0	10.0	10.0	11.3
G4	12.0	10.0	11.0	11.0
G5	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G6	12.0	12.0	11.0	11.7
G7	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G8	12.0	11.0	11.0	11.3
G9	12.0	12.0	14.0	12.7
G10	12.0	3.0	12.0	9.0
G11	12.0	9.0	12.0	11.0
G12	12.0	12.0	14.0	12.7
G13	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G14	12.0	12.0	10.0	11.3
G15	12.0	6.0	5.0	7.7
G16	12.0	7.0	11.0	10.0
G17	12.0	11.0	10.0	11.0
G18	12.0	12.0	9.0	11.0
G19	12.0	10.0	9.0	10.3
G20	12.0	11.0	10.0	11.0
G21	12.0	9.0	8.0	9.7
G22	12.0	8.0	11.0	10.3
G23	12.0	9.0	9.0	10.0
G24	12.0	11.0	8.0	10.3
G25	12.0	10.0	8.0	10.0
G26	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G27	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G28	12.0	9.0	11.0	10.7
G29	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G30	12.0	11.0	12.0	11.7
G31	12.0	12.0	14.0	12.7
G32	12.0	14.0	10.0	15.3
G33	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G34	12.0	17.0	14.0	14.3
G35	12.0	9.0	12.0	11.0
G36	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G37	12.0	11.0	8.0	10.3
G38	12.0	17.0	16.0	15.0
G39	12.0	12.0	17.0	13.7
G40	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G41	12.0	10.0	10.0	10.7
G42	12.0	16.0	12.0	13.3
G43	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G44	12.0	11.0	12.0	11.7
G45	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
G46	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
AVERAGE	12.0	11.1	11.5	11.5
		STANDARD	DEVIATION	1.4

DROPOUT FAMILY GRADE COMPLETION

NAME CODE	GRADE COMPLETED	FATHER	MOTHER	FAMILY AVERAGE
D1	10.0	11.0	9.0	10.0
D2	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.7
D3	9.0	4.0	6.0	7.0
D4	9.0	9.0	8.0	7.3
D5	9.0	9.0	7.0	8.3
D6	10.0	6.0	8.0	8.7
D7	10.0	6.0	8.0	8.7
D8	9.0	8.0	10.0	9.0
D9	11.0	11.0	16.0	12.7
D10	9.0	4.0	5.0	5.3
D11	9.0	6.0	10.0	8.3
D12	9.0	6.0	8.0	7.7
D13	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.3
D14	9.0	8.0	9.0	8.7
D15	11.0	8.0	9.0	9.3
D16	9.0	4.0	4.0	4.3
D17	9.0	3.0	3.0	5.0
D18	9.0	8.0	6.0	7.7
D19	9.0	8.0	8.0	8.3
D20	9.0	6.0	8.0	7.0
D21	11.0	8.0	3.0	7.3
D22	11.0	8.0	8.0	9.0
D23	9.0	8.0	9.0	8.7
D24	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.3
D25	9.0	8.0	12.0	9.7
D26	10.0	10.0	8.0	9.3
D27	10.0	9.0	8.0	9.0
AVERAGE	9.4	7.1	8.1	8.2

STANDARD DEVIATION 1.5

PARENTAL OCCUPATIONS OF DROPOUTS

The second area of related research addressed parental occupations. The sample of one hundred dropouts yielded thirty five usable samples, whereas the sample of fifty graduates yielded forty six productive samples. The dropout research, in relation to professionals yielded 0% males and 3% females in relation to 13% males and 13% female of the graduate parents. Skilled labor research concluded 46% males and 0% females of dropouts in relation to 72% males and 17% females of the graduates were in this category. The category of unskilled labor produced 31% males and 97% females of dropouts in relation to 11% males and 63% females of graduates. The category of unemployed produced 9% males and 0% females of dropouts in relation to 2% males and 2% females of graduates. The area of retirement rendered 3% males and 0% females of dropouts in relation to 2% males and 0% females of graduates. The area of unknown produced 0% in both male and female categories for dropouts and 2% for both male and female of the graduates.

The marked concern areas of related research analysis addresses 1) the productive samples of dropouts, 2) the heavy concentration of unskilled occupations and 3) the elevated percentage of disabilities in relation to the graduate sample. These areas are evidently disproportional and need to be considered in future research.

DROPOUT PARENT OCCUPATION REPORT

NAME CODE	PRO - PROFESSIONAL		SKILLED		UN - SKILLED		UN - EMPLOYED		RETIRED		DISABLED		UNKNOWN	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
D1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
D3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D6	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D7	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
D8	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D9	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D11	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
D12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
D13	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D15	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D16	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D18	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
D19	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D20	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D21	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D22	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D23	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D24	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
D25	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D26	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D27	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D28	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D29	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D30	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D31	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D32	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D33	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D34	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D35	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	1	16	0	11	34	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	0
AVERAGE	0%	3%	46%	0%	31%	97%	9%	0%	3%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%

GRADUATE PARENT OCCUPATION REPORT

NAME CODE	PRO - FESSIONAL		SKILLED		SEMI - SKILLED		UN - EMPLOYED		RETIRED		DISABLED		UNKNOWN	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
G1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
G5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G6	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G7	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G8	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G9	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G10	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G11	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G12	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G13	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G14	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
G16	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G17	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G18	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G19	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G20	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G21	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G22	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G23	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G24	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G25	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G26	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G27	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G28	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G29	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G30	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G31	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G32	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G33	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G34	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G35	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G36	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G37	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G38	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G39	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G40	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G41	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G42	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G43	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G44	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G45	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G46	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	6	6	33	8	5	29	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
AVERAGE	13%	13%	72%	17%	11%	63%	2%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%	2%

FOOTNOTES

1) West Virginia Dropout Summary, 1982-1983 and 1983-1984

2) Judicial Appearance Analysis, 25th Judicial District 1983, John McMillian

Works Consulted

Adult Court Records for the 25th Judicial Circuit

Juvenile Court Records for 25th Judicial Circuit

McMillian, John: Judicial Appearance Analysis, 1983

West Virginia Department of Education Dropout Summary 1982-1983

West Virginia Department of Education Dropout Summary 1983-1984

Williams, Ronnie L.: Boone County Dropout Study, 1984

EARLY DETECTION FACTORS COMMON TO POTENTIAL SCHOOL DROPOUTS

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary and Conclusions Pertaining to Early Detection Factors Common to Potential School Dropouts

Productive research analysis can only be utilized through a relalistic summary and reasonable conclusions pertaining to the areas evaluated. The research addresing sixteen year old dropouts indicated 49.67% of all state dropouts, 56.06% of the county dropouts and 91.51% of the county dropout research sample fell within this age range. The state and county dropout analysis clearly indicated a trend in prolonged school attendance. The research revealed over half of the dropouts terminate their school tenure on or before their sixteenth birthday. The remarkable statistic indicated a majority of state dropouts and 97% of the county dropouts terminate their school attendance on or before their seventeenth birthday.

The educational system needs to view these statistics in that students seem to be having school experiences that make terminating their attendance the most pleasant way out. A happy student tends to complete his school endeavors and the parents are very supportive of the educational systems.

Retentions tend to be synonomous with a postiive indicator of dropouts. Dropouts tend to be retained fifty-seven (57%) percent of the time in comparison to four (4%) percent by graduates. These facts are only a small segment of the total picture that identifies dropouts.

Academic performance would be a major factor in predicting dropouts. One academic assumption would conclude a student who can not

academically succeed will become frustrated in the traditional school setting, and with a sigh of relief terminate his or her school attendance. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) test scores gave dropouts a score of two yaers and three months (-2.3) below grade level. One might also conclude, through research analysis, that a student, who is academically deficient, upon entering the junior high school setting tends to become very frustrated. One basic factor leading to this frustrating experiences is, subjects are usually presented on a prescribed grade level. The students experiencing academic difficulty tend to become further behind and their frustration clearly increases their school absenteeism. Research clearly indicates graduates, on an average, are four months (+0.4) above grade level and their average yearly absences are 5.4 days in comparison to 20 days per year for dropouts.

Dropouts and court appearances seem to have a distinctive correlation factor. Research indicates the total general county population was .50% of the sample in judicial litigation. Research indicated 24.23% of the juvenile dropouts and 14.64% of eighteen year old dropouts have court convictions recorded. The remarkable statistic is that 2% of the graduates appeared in juvenile court and no graduates appeared in court when they were eighteen years old.

Family grade completion, according to our statistical calculations, has a remarkable significant difference. The Critical Ratio (CR) of 86.67 clearly indicated that less than $\pm$ 2.58% of the sample fell outside the normal curve. The family educational statistics identified a two year fourt month educational difference between dropouts and graduates. The fathers of dropouts were four years behind the graduate

father educationally and the mothers were three years and four months behind educationally. The average educational family status of dropouts was three years and three months behind the family average of graduates.

Parental occupational status clearly revealed a high percentage of graduates located in the skilled and professional occupational areas and dropouts tend to be found in the unskilled area and unemployed. Research clearly indicated a high percentage of dropout parent samples did not prdoduce data for the research analysis. This factor should be considered for future study.

The research pertaining to early dropout detection factors indicated dropouts tend to be absent from school more frequently, have significantly lower test scores in the academic areas of reading, mathematics, and social studies. Their poor academic performance produced dropouts who repeated grades more frequently than graduates.

Dropouts tend to originate from homes with significantly lower educational levels and the parents tend to be employed in unskilled areas or unemployed. Dropouts tend to frequent the judicial system as juveniles and adults more often than graduates.

The school systems should strive to improve the academic performance of students, increase student attendance and coordinate programs with parents or potential dropouts. The preventative measures are to curb the negative attitudes generated by the school system. The Boone County Dropout Study of 1983, clearly indicated students withdrew from school with evident negative attitudes toward the school curriculum as well as the personnel.

Research revealed the dropout detection factors are interrelated. The isolation of one factor would not be valid in dropout detection, in

that all items analyzed were of significant importance in dropout detection.

One positive factor for the educational system is the family educational status. The present dropouts tend to complete two years and three months of schooling beyond their father's status and one year and three months beyond their mother's. This trend may be increased by specialized and individualized student and family instruction.

The educational system must be prepared to address the demand for specialized programs, in that dropouts are performing on an educational level of seven years and one month (7.1) of education. The fathers of dropouts perform on a four year and eight months (4.8) educational level and the mothers on a five year and eight month (5.8) educational performance level.

Research clearly indicates special remedial programs must be instituted in the early school years to insure the success of all students. Student success will produce better school attendance, higher test scores, lower retention rates, higher family educational levels, lower the rate of court appearances and increase the student's chances of greater job satisfaction.

The research also clearly indicates that the early detection factors of dropouts are direclty interrelated. The research concludes that all factors are not necessary to produce a dropout, but the greater the number of detection factors the greater the chances of becoming a dropout. The major task of the educational system is to eliminate as many of the contributing factors to dropouts as possible.